Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ing something like a crown. The lobes are of a thicker texture than the claws, and of a dead white color, whereas the claws are translucent: the two are readily pulled apart. In the young petal a strong midrib seems to pass through the base of the claw from front to back and thence to run up to the lobes, where it branches variously, but the only other nerves of the claw are two faint ones continued up near the outside margin of the lobes. At the top of the claw, from the bilobation of the petal, is a pretty deep groove, marked at its commencement by two strong convexities, which have probably been mistaken for the crown of the petals as they have no other. I am satisfied that these are only convexities of the claw, the tissue being thin, and the concavities on the opposite side manifest. I have gone into these details, as I think this structure throws light on the question of the origin of the crown in Silene. In the staminate flowers there is a pink nectariferous spot, more or less conspicuous, where the lobes meet the groove.

The duller color of the pistillate form, and the somewhat greater predominance of the family pink in the other, may perhaps be explained by reference to wind and insect agency. The nice taste of insects for color can have escaped no one who has attended to the fertilization of flowers. There are some broad views on this subject in the admirable article in the American Naturalist for July, translated by R. L. Packard from Muller and Delpino.

It would be interesting to compare the average number and weight of the seeds of the two kinds of capsules, and also to watch how the agency of insects is employed in the fertilization. I have not had the opportunity of doing this myself, being indebted to my friend Mr. Le Roy for supplies of the flower. It is abundant in some parts of Westchester Co., and the two kinds grow in company.

I have not been able to find any notice of the dimorphism of this plant, later than Linnæus, who *(Spec. Plant. Ed.* 3.*)* after describing Cucubalus Behen, has these words:

"*Varietas feminea in Horto upsaliensi frequens. Hæc Hermaphrodito minor. Calyces exacte ovati, magis obscuri nec oblongo-ovati. Corolla minor. Stamina corolla dimidio breviora terminata tuberculo absque antheris. Styli* 3–5 *corolla longiores declinati. Planta utraque fertilis.*"

The only other instances of dimorphism that I can recall occur in Lythraceæ, Rubiaceæ and Primulaceæ, with a tendency to it in Polemoniaceæ. All these orders, including Caryophyllaceæ, have generally opposite or whorled leaves. Having formed a theory, which was strengthened by this consideration, I thought the Gentian family a suitable one to investigate for other examples. In looking over my not very extensive collection I was fortunate to find in Menyanthes trifoliata, L., a decided case of dimorphism, though the style in all the flowers finally becomes much elongated. The fact is of interest, but the theory halts, for Menyanthes belongs to the section of Gentianaceæ with alternate leaves. W. H. L.

47. **Linnæa borealis,** Gron.—You remember the doubts about the plant which I found at Babylon, L. I., in 1868, and which I have insisted was Linnæa. Well, while I was at Crown Point, I came upon the same plant, but there were no flowers. After considerable

search I found the fruit, and, at last, one withered and dried bell which had not fallen. There was no longer a doubt as to this plant at least; and, in the study I gave it there in the woods, it was easy to see what had occasioned it as to the specimen from Babylon. That consisted of the ends of the summer runners only. I compared the plants on my return, and was fully convinced there could be no mistake.

I determined, therefore, to go to Babylon and see if I could find the plant, knowing nearly the locality in which I had found it three years ago. I went yesterday. The locality was considerably changed by the cutting away of the woods along the rail-road (South Side R. R.). I hunted for three hours the place over; in the wood and out of it; around the stumps, under the brush and bushes, in the sun and in the shade. When I failed to find it, I took "a new departure" where it *seemed* to have been, with no better success. I found plenty of *Arctostaphylos Uva-ursi*, *Chimaphila umbellata* and *C. maculata*, *Gaultheria procumbens*, and *Cypripedium acaule*—but no Linnæa. I had at length about abandoned all hope of it, and concluded that it had died out with the cutting away of the woods, when I struck upon a few scattered plants. You may imagine my satisfaction! Down on my knees I went, and searched for the fruit like a miner for nuggets. I struck upon the little forked scapes—but no fruit. I soon, however, traced it to the bed where it has taken possession of the ground, like *Nepeta Glechoma*, almost to the exclusion of all other plants. It covers a space 50 feet square, and, of course, there I found the fruit, and, at last, under some bushes, in the shade, one little scape with its two beautiful, blushing bells, fresh and fragant, rewarded my search.

I mention this, not only because I think you may feel a *personal* interest in the finding, but as showing how very local a plant may be, for Dr. Torrey thinks it has never been seen elsewhere on the island, and even in the New Durham swamp it is supposed to have been placed by Michaux. It gives hope, also, that we may yet find *Corema Conradii*, *Clitoria Mariana*, and some other plants which were long ago reported, but have not since been found on the island. They will be met with only by long search, or be come upon by accident. Knowing, as I thought, just where to find this, I hunted three hours for it, and was about giving up the search, when I fell upon it.

It is about 70 feet north of the rail-road and 900 feet east of the lane. July 14th, J. S. M.

48. **Tetramerism in Tradescantia.**—Early in June, I noticed with much interest a fourparted flower on a bush of Tradescantia Virginica, in my little city garden. The bush was very vigorous, and bearing profusely. I pressed this flower at once, and then began to watch for more. About a week later, another one appeared on the bush; and in order the better to examine the ovary, I allowed this one to remain two or three weeks. Both these flowers had four sepals, four petals, and eight stamens, a perfect example of tetramerism, as far as the ovary. This I could not judge of in the pressed specimen; but, on examining the other when it had somewhat matured, I